

REMARKS

At the outset, Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thorough review and consideration of the subject application. The Office Action of September 8, 2004 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 10–16, 22, and 27 are hereby amended; and claims 18–19 and 24–25 are hereby canceled. Accordingly, claims 1–17, 20–23, and 26–27 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested

In the Office Action dated September 8, 2004, the Examiner rejects claims 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite; rejects claims 1, 5, and 7–8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0008792 A1 by Chung et al. (hereinafter “Chung”); rejects claims 2–3, 6, 9–10, 12–14, 20–21 and 26–27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chung in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,253,091 to Kimura et al. (hereinafter “Kimura”); rejects claims 4, 11, 15–19, and 22–25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chung in view of Kimura, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,436,747 to Suzuki (hereinafter “Suzuki”).

In the Office Action dated September 8, 2004, the Examiner rejects claims 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite. In response, the Applicant respectfully refers the Examiner to paragraph [0051] of the specification, which states that the “liquid crystal cells within odd-numbered horizontal lines (i.e., liquid crystal cells including TFTs connected to odd-numbered gate lines GL1, GL3, GL5, etc.) are connected to preceding ones of adjacent data lines DLi (hereinafter, i is a positive integer),” and “the liquid crystal cells within even-numbered horizontal lines (i.e., liquid crystal cells including TFTs connected to an even-numbered gate lines GL2, GL4, GL6, etc.) are connected to successive ones of adjacent data lines DLi+1.” Applicant respectfully submits that this redresses the Examiner’s rejection.

In the Office Action dated September 8, 2004, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 5, and 7–8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Chung. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and requests reconsideration. Independent claim 1 is allowable over Chung in that it recites “a groove formed within a second side portion of the pixel electrode adjacent the plurality of data lines, wherein the second side portion is opposite the first side portion, so that the pixel electrode has a substantially diagonally symmetric shape.” Nothing in Chung teaches or

suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, and claims 2–8, which depend from claim 1, are allowable over Chung.

In the Office Action dated September 8, 2004, the Examiner rejects claims 2–3, 6, 9–10, 12–14, 20–21 and 26–27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chung in view of Kimura. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and requests reconsideration. Claims 2–3 and 6, which depend from amended claim 1, are allowable in that Kimura fails to cure the deficiency of Chung to teach or suggest “a groove formed within a second side portion of the pixel electrode adjacent the plurality of data lines, wherein the second side portion is opposite the first side portion, so that the pixel electrode has a substantially diagonally symmetric shape.” Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2–3 and 6 are allowable over the cited references.

Independent claim 9 is allowable in that Chung and Kimura, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the recited elements of the claim. For example, amended claim 9 recites a pixel electrode wherein “the pixel electrode has a substantially diagonally symmetric shape.” Nothing in Chung in Kimura teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 9, and claims 10–17 and 20, which depend from claim 9, are allowable over the cited references.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of independent claim 21 and requests reconsideration because Chung and Kimura, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the elements recited in the claim. For example, independent claim 21 is allowable over the Chung and Kimura in that the claim recites a pixel electrode that “has a substantially diagonally symmetric shape so that an area of side portions of the plurality of pixel electrodes adjacent the plurality of data lines is substantially equal.” Nothing in Chung or Kimura, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 21, and claims 22–23, which depend from claim 21, are allowable over the cited references.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of independent claim 26–27 and requests reconsideration because Chung and Kimura, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the elements recited in amended independent claim 26. For example, claim 26 recites a pixel electrode that “has a substantially diagonally symmetric shape.” Nothing in Chung or Kimura, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 26, and claim 27, which depends from claim 26, are allowable over the cited references.

In the Office Action dated September 8, 2004, the Examiner rejects claims 4, 11, 15–19, and 22–25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chung in view of Kimura, and in further view of Suzuki. Claim 4, which depends from claim 1, is allowable in that the additional reference, Suzuki, fails to cure the deficiency of Chung and Kimura to teach or suggest “a groove formed within a second side portion of the pixel electrode adjacent the plurality of data lines, wherein the second side portion is opposite the first side portion, so that the pixel electrode has a substantially diagonally symmetric shape.” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 4 is allowable over the cited references.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 11, and 15–17 and requests reconsideration. Claims 11, 15, and 17–19, which depend from amended independent claim 9, are allowable in that Suzuki fails to cure the deficiency of Chung and Kimura to teach or suggest a pixel electrode having “a substantially diagonally symmetric shape.” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 11, 15–17, which depend from claim 9, are allowable over the cited references.

By this amendment, claims 24–25 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 22–23 and requests reconsideration in that the references, Chung, Kimura, and Suzuki, alone or combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the recited elements of amended independent claim 21. For example, claim 22 recites a pixel electrode having “a substantially diagonally symmetric shape.” Nothing in Chung, Kimura, and Suzuki teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 22–23 are allowable over the cited references.

If the Examiner deems that a telephone conversation would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (202) 496-7500.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: January 10, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Rebecca G. Rudich

Registration No.: 41,786

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorney for Applicant